

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

- 1 -

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Marvit, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/807,562  
Filing Date: March 23, 2004  
Confirmation No. 4041  
Group Art Unit: 2629  
Examiner: Regina Liang  
Title: *Motion Controlled Remote Controller*

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
WITH THE USPTO ON  
September 27, 2007

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Appellants have appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (the "Board") from the decision of the Examiner transmitted March 27, 2007, finally rejecting all pending Claims 1-20. Appellants filed a Notice of Appeal on June 27, 2007.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

- 2 -

**Real Party In Interest**

This application is currently owned by Fujitsu Limited, as indicated by an assignment recorded on August 2, 2004 in the Assignment Records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 015647/0681.

**Related Appeals and Interferences**

Appellants have appealed to the Board rejections in U.S. patent application serial no. 10/807,572, which includes similar disclosure as that of the present application. To the knowledge of Appellants' counsel, there are no other known appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings that may directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision regarding this Appeal.

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Application and stand rejected pursuant to a final Office Action transmitted March 27, 2007 (the "Office Action") and are all presented for appeal. All pending claims are shown in Appendix A, attached hereto, along with an indication of the status of those claims.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

- 5 -

**Status of Amendments**

All amendments submitted by Appellants have been entered by the Examiner.

**Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

Claim 1 of the present application recites a handheld device. The device includes a display having a viewable surface and operable to generate an image indicating a currently controlled remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes a gesture database maintaining a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device also includes a motion detection module operable to detect motion of the handheld device within three dimensions and to identify components of the motion in relation to the viewable surface (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device also includes a control module operable to track movement of the handheld device using the motion detection module, to compare the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture, and to identify the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device additionally includes a wireless interface operable to transmit the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13).

Claim 8 of the present application recites a method for remotely controlling devices that includes generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The method includes maintaining a gesture database comprising a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The method includes maintaining a gesture mapping database

comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The method includes tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The method also includes comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture and identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The method also includes transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13).

Claim 14 of the present application recites logic for controlling a handheld device, the logic embodied as a computer program in a computer readable medium and operable when executed to perform the steps of generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The logic is operable to perform the step of maintaining a gesture database comprising a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The logic is operable to perform the step of maintaining a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The logic is also operable to perform the step of tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The logic is also operable to perform the steps of comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture and identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The logic is also operable to perform the step of transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for

delivery to the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13).

Claim 20 of the present application recites a motion controlled handheld device that includes means for generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes means for maintaining a gesture database maintaining a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes means for maintaining a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes means for tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device includes means for comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture and means for identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13). The device also includes means for transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device (as an example only and not by way of limitation, see Figures 1 and 15; Page 38, Line 30 – Page 40, Line 13).



**Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

Appellants request that the Board review the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,598,187 issued to Ide et al. ("*Ide*"), in view of U.S. Patent App. No. 2004/0061621 issued to Ishida ("*Ishida*"). Appellants additionally request that the Board review the Examiner's rejections of Claims 7, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ide* in view of *Ishida* and further in view of WO 01/86920 issued to Lapidot ("*Lapidot*").

**Argument**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ide* in view of *Ishida*. The Examiner rejects Claims 7, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ide* in view of *Ishida* and further in view of *Lapidot*.

**I. The Examiner's Rejections of Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20 are Improper**

**A. The Proposed Combination of *Ide* and *Ishida* Fails to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Each and Every Claim Limitation.**

Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of *Ide* and *Ishida* proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Appellants' claims. For example, Claim 1 recites a handheld device comprising:

a control module operable to track movement of the handheld device using the motion detection module, to compare the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture, and to identify the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture; and  
a wireless interface operable to transmit the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.

Independent Claims 8, 14, and 20 recite similar elements. The Examiner relies on column 14, lines 7-47 of *Ide* to teach these elements. *See* Office Action, p. 5. *Ide* describes a spatial motion pattern input system and states that movements of a mouse are divided into movements with two directions and turned into amplified signals. *See Ide*, col. 14, lines 22-28. Unwanted components are removed from the amplified signals, and the amplified signals are converted "into digital signals, which are supplied to the motion recognizing section 41." *Ide*, col. 14, lines 28-32. Then, "the motion recognizing section 41 first converts the signals indicating movements with two directions into motion pattern data in the same format as that of the basic data. . . . Then, a motion code indicating the corresponding basic motion pattern is acquired." *Ide*, col. 14, lines 37-43. Finally, the control target device receives the code, and "the control target device executes a control process according to the given code." *Ide*, col. 14, lines 46-48.

In Appellants' Claim 1, movement is tracked, a matching gesture is determined, a corresponding command is identified, and the identified *command* is delivered to the remote device. In contrast, as indicated above, *Ide* discloses that a *code* is sent to the remote device and then the device must "execute[ ] a control process according to the given motion code." *Ide*, col. 14, lines 46-48. In response to an argument by Appellants that *Ide* fails to disclose "a wireless interface operable to transmit the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device," the Examiner stated that "the motion code indicating the corresponding basic motion pattern is the identified command." Office Action, p. 8. *Ide*, however, does not associate "command" with "code," and there is no support for this association. Multiple codes can be sent in *Ide*, and the target device "may carry out a suitable operation on the basis of the given pairs of data items." *See Ide*, col. 14, line 63 – col. 15, line 1. Thus, in *Ide* a "motion code" indicating a corresponding "basic motion pattern" is transmitted. *Ide* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a wireless interface operable to "transmit the *command* to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device." *Ishida* does not cure this deficiency.

**B. The Proposed *Ide-Ishida* Combination is Improper.**

Appellants respectfully submit that the combination of *Ide* and *Ishida* proposed by the Examiner is improper because it would not be obvious to combine *Ide* and *Ishida* in the manner the Examiner proposes.

**1. The Obviousness Standard.**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references must teach or suggest all elements of the rejected claims and it must have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine or modify the references. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, No. 04-1350 (2007); *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As indicate above, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all elements of the rejected claims. In addition, the proposed combination is improper.

In *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, the Supreme Court clarified the appropriate standard to use when determining obviousness. 550 U.S. \_\_\_, No. 04-1350 (2007). "The [obviousness] analysis is objective: 'Under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art are to

be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined." *Id.* (citing *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966)).

A "principal reason for declining to allow patents for what is obvious" is to prevent individuals from obtaining a patent "for a combination which only unites old elements with no change in their respective functions." *Id.* However, the Supreme Court clarified that "a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art." *Id.* "[A] court must ask whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions." *Id.* While not a rigid test, a showing of a "teaching, suggestion, or motivation" to combine or modify prior art provides helpful insight in determining whether it would have been obvious to combine references. *Id.* "A factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning." *Id.* (citing *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 36).

If a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. It is clear that the proposed *Ide-Ishida* combination does not, taken as a whole, suggest the claimed invention, taken as a whole. In fact, portions of *Ide* teach away from Appellants' claims, as set forth above. Respectfully, it appears that the Examiner has merely pieced together disjointed portions of references, with the benefit of hindsight using Appellants' claims as a blueprint, in an attempt to reconstruct Appellants' claims.

## **2. It Would Not be Obvious to Combine *Ide* and *Ishida*.**

According to the Examiner, "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the handheld device of *Ide* to have a display as taught by *Ishida* such that a user can control the device while viewing the build-in monitor ([0013], [0041] of *Ishida*)." Office Action, p. 6. Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's assertion that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Ide*

with the teachings of *Ishida* to purportedly arrive at Appellants' invention is entirely insufficient to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under the M.P.E.P. and the governing Federal Circuit case law.

As indicated above, the Examiner's proposed combination is to place a display on the handheld device of *Ide* so that a user can control the device while viewing the built-in monitor. In response to Appellants' previous argument that there is no motivation to combine *Ide* and *Ishida*, the Office Action states that "Ishida clearly provided reasons to combine and provide for a monitor on the remote control device." Office Action, p. 8. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. "Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, No. 04-1350 (2007) (citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). Thus, the fact that the teachings of one reference would improve the teachings of another reference does not provide the required suggestion to combine or modify. If a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. Even if *Ishida* does provide for a monitor on a control device, *Ide* clearly teaches away from any combination that places a monitor on its spatial control device as described in *Ide*. *Ide* refers to its input device as a "spatial control mouse" and repeatedly thereafter as a "mouse." A conventional mouse (for example, the well-known ball mouse or optical mouse used with a personal computer) does not include a built-in display. A mouse is typically used to move a cursor on a screen. As *Ide* states, "the operator moves the mouse on the desk to move the cursor interlocking with the mouse movement to the desired object . . . appearing on the display. With the cursor positioned over the desired object on the display, he clicks (or releases) an acknowledge switch called a click button of the mouse to enter data to the system." *Ide*, col. 1, lines 21-28. Thus, when using the mouse, the user watches the screen to track the movement of the cursor while the user's hand is on the mouse. There is therefore no motivation to put a viewable display on the mouse because the user rarely has reason to look away from the screen and toward the mouse while using the mouse. Using a three-

dimensional input device as described by *Ide* is similar. *Ide* says, "[t]he operator moves the three-dimensional input device in space to move the cursor interlocking with the movement of the input device to the desired object on the screen." *Ide*, col. 1, lines 52-58. Further, the user's hand covers the majority of the surface of a mouse, so any viewable display on the mouse would be largely blocked from the user's view while the user was operating the mouse. Because of these well-known attributes of its use, there is no motivation to include a viewable display on an input device as described by *Ide*, and the cited references teach away from such a combination.

Accordingly, since there is no motivation to make the proposed combination and since the prior art teaches away from the proposed combination, it would not be obvious to combine *Ide* with *Ishida* in the manner the Examiner proposes. Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's conclusions set forth in the Office Action do not meet the requirements set forth in the M.P.E.P. and the governing Federal Circuit case law for demonstrating a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Because the proposed combination does not disclose each element of each claim as discussed above in Section I.A and because the proposed combination is improper as discussed above in Section I.B, Appellants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejections and request that the Board overturn the rejections of these claims.

Claims 2-6 each depends from Claim 1, Claims 9-12 each depends from Claim 8, and Claims 16-18 each depends from Claim 14. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 8, and 14, Appellants respectfully request that the Board overturn the rejections of Claims 2-6, 9-12, and 16-18.

## **II. The Examiner's Rejections of Claims 7, 13, and 19 are Improper.**

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1, Claim 13 depends from Claim 8, and Claim 19 depends from Claim 14. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

- 15 -

1, 8, and 14, Appellants respectfully request that the Board overturn the rejections of Claims 7, 13, and 19.

- 16 -

**CONCLUSION**

Appellant has demonstrated that the present invention, as claimed, is clearly distinguishable over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Therefore, Appellant respectfully requests the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to reverse the Examiner's final rejection of the pending claims and instruct the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$500.00 in payment for this Appeal Brief, \$120.00 in payment for the one month extension fee, any other fee and credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Appellant



Chad C. Walters  
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: September 27, 2007

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer No.: **05073**



**Appendix A: Claims on Appeal**

1. (Original) A handheld device comprising:
  - a display having a viewable surface and operable to generate an image indicating a currently controlled remote device;
  - a gesture database maintaining a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device;
  - a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device;
  - a motion detection module operable to detect motion of the handheld device within three dimensions and to identify components of the motion in relation to the viewable surface;
  - a control module operable to track movement of the handheld device using the motion detection module, to compare the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture, and to identify the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture; and
  - a wireless interface operable to transmit the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.
2. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 1, wherein the remote receiver comprises a wireless interface of the remote device.
3. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 1, wherein the remote receiver comprises an element of a public wireless telephone network.
4. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 1, wherein the remote device comprises audio/visual equipment.
5. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 4, wherein the identified command controls output of the audio/visual equipment.

- 18 -

6. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 1, wherein the wireless interface is further operable to transmit the matching gesture to the remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.

7. (Original) The handheld device of Claim 1, further comprising:  
a first accelerometer operable to detect acceleration along a first axis;  
a second accelerometer operable to detect acceleration along a second axis, the second axis perpendicular to the first axis; and  
a third accelerometer operable to detect acceleration along a third axis, the third axis perpendicular to the first axis and perpendicular to the second axis; and wherein:  
the gesture database further defines each of the remote command gestures using a sequence of accelerations;  
the motion detection module is further operable to detect motion of the device using accelerations measured by the first accelerometer, the second accelerometer, and the third accelerometer; and  
the control module is further operable to match the accelerations measured by the motion detection module against gesture definitions in the gesture database to identify particular ones of the remote command gestures.

8. (Original) A method for remotely controlling devices comprising:  
generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device;  
maintaining a gesture database comprising a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device;  
maintaining a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device;  
tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface;  
comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture;  
identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture; and  
transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.
9. (Original) The method of Claim 8, wherein the remote receiver comprises a wireless interface of the remote device.
10. (Original) The method of Claim 8, wherein the remote receiver comprises an element of a public wireless telephone network.
11. (Original) The method of Claim 8, wherein the remote device comprises audio/visual equipment.
12. (Original) The method of Claim 11, wherein the identified command controls output of the audio/visual equipment.

- 20 -

13. (Original) The method of Claim 8, wherein the gesture database further defines each of the remote command gestures using a sequence of accelerations; the method further comprising:

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a first axis;

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a second axis, the second axis perpendicular to the first axis; and

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a third axis, the third axis perpendicular to the first axis and perpendicular to the second axis;

detecting motion of the device using accelerations measured by the first accelerometer, the second accelerometer, and the third accelerometer; and

matching the accelerations against gesture definitions in the gesture database to identify potential indicated ones of the remote command gestures.

14. (Previously Presented) Logic for controlling a handheld device, the logic embodied as a computer program in a computer readable medium and operable when executed to perform the steps of:

generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device;

maintaining a gesture database comprising a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device;

maintaining a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device;

tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface;

comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture;

identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture; and

transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.

15. (Original) The logic of Claim 14, wherein the remote receiver comprises a wireless interface of the remote device.

16. (Original) The logic of Claim 14, wherein the remote receiver comprises an element of a public wireless telephone network.

17. (Original) The logic of Claim 14, wherein the remote device comprises audio/visual equipment.

18. (Original) The logic of Claim 17, wherein the identified command controls output of the audio/visual equipment.

19. (Original) The logic of Claim 14, wherein the gesture database further defines each of the remote command gestures using a sequence of accelerations; the logic further operable when executed to perform the steps of:

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a first axis;

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a second axis, the second axis perpendicular to the first axis; and

detecting acceleration of the handheld device along a third axis, the third axis perpendicular to the first axis and perpendicular to the second axis;

detecting motion of the device using accelerations measured by the first accelerometer, the second accelerometer, and the third accelerometer; and

matching the accelerations against gesture definitions in the gesture database to identify potential indicated ones of the remote command gestures.

20. (Original) A motion controlled handheld device comprising:
- means for generating, on a viewable surface of a handheld device, an image indicating a currently controlled remote device;
  - means for maintaining a gesture database maintaining a plurality of remote command gestures, each remote command gesture defined by a motion of the device with respect to a first position of the handheld device;
  - means for maintaining a gesture mapping database comprising a mapping of each of the remote command gestures to an associated command for controlling operation of the remote device;
  - means for tracking movement of the handheld device in relation to the viewable surface;
  - means for comparing the tracked movement against the remote command gestures to determine a matching gesture;
  - means for identifying the one of the commands corresponding to the matching gesture; and
  - means for transmitting the identified command to a remote receiver for delivery to the remote device.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

24

**Appendix B: Evidence**

**NONE**



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
073338.0190  
(04-50462 FLA)

PATENT APPLICATION  
10/807,562

25

**Appendix C: Related Proceedings**

**NONE**